IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JORGE L. PORTALATIN, : CIVIL ACTION : NO. 14-3011

Petitioner,

:

V.

:

WARDEN SCI CAMPHILL, et al.,

:

Respondents. :

MEMORANDUM

EDUARDO C. ROBRENO, J.

June 5, 2017

Jorge Portalatin ("Petitioner") is a prisoner at the State Correctional Institution in Camp Hill, Pennsylvania.

Petitioner filed a pro se application seeking relief through a writ of habeas corpus, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Magistrate Judge Timothy R. Rice ("Judge Rice"), finding that Petitioner's claims were untimely and not subject to equitable tolling, recommended that the Habeas Petition be dismissed with prejudice. Petitioner filed objections. For the reasons that follow, the Court will overrule Petitioner's objections and deny the Habeas Petition as untimely.

I. BACKGROUND

On June 11, 2007, before the Court of Common Pleas of Northampton County, Petitioner pled guilty to two counts of endangering the welfare of children and one count of aggravated indecent assault on a person under the age of 13. Report & Recommendation at 1, ECF No. 3 [hereinafter R&R]. Several months later, the court sentenced Petitioner to 10 to 24 years of imprisonment. <u>Id.</u> Petitioner appealed to the Pennsylvania Superior Court, but later discontinued this appeal. <u>Id.</u>

Petitioner then filed a petition for collateral relief under Pennsylvania's Post-Conviction Relief Act ("PCRA"). <u>Id.</u> On September 24, 2009, the PCRA court denied the petition, <u>id.</u>, and the Superior Court affirmed, <u>id.</u> at 1-2.

On June 28, 2012, Petitioner filed a second PCRA petition. <u>Id.</u> at 2. This petition was also dismissed, and the dismissal was again affirmed by the Superior Court. <u>Id.</u> On February 10, 2014, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court denied Petitioner's request for allocatur. <u>Id.</u>

Petitioner filed the instant Habeas Petition on February 26, 2014. Id. Judge Rice issued a Report and Recommendation ("R&R") on June 18, 2014. ECF No. 3. On July 8, 2014, the Court, believing that Petitioner was not objecting to the R&R, approved and adopted the R&R and dismissed the Habeas Petitioner. ECF No. 5. Shortly thereafter, however, the Court

received Petitioner's Objections, ECF No. 4, and vacated its Order dismissing the Petitioner, ECF No. 6. The Habeas Petition is now again ripe for disposition.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

The Court may refer an application for a writ of habeas corpus to a U.S. Magistrate Judge for a report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). A prisoner may object to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation within fourteen days after being served with a copy thereof. See § 636(b)(1); E.D. Pa. R. Civ. P. 72.1(IV)(b). The Court must then "make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." \$ 636(b)(1). The Court does not review general objections. See Brown v. Astrue, 649 F.3d 193, 195 (3d Cir. 2011) ("We have provided that § 636(b)(1) requires district courts to review such objections de novo unless the objection is not timely or not specific." (internal quotation marks omitted)). The Court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

On habeas review, the Court must determine whether the state court's adjudication of the claims raised was (1) contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly established